

EXHIBIT B

Page 1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY
(Trenton)

Civil Action No.: 3:22-cv-05887(RK)(JTQ)

JOHN DOE,

Plaintiff, : DEPOSITION OF:

v. : COLE M. CRITTENDEN, PhD

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY,

Defendant. : :

X-----X

TRANSCRIPT of the testimony as taken by and before CHERYL McGANN, a Certified Court Reporter of the State of New Jersey, held from multiple locations via Zoom Teleconference, on Thursday, October 3rd, 2024, commencing at 10:33 in the forenoon.

Page 2

1 A P P E A R A N C E S :

2 (All parties remote)

3 DILLON PLLC (DC)

4 BY: CHRISTOPHER C. MUHA, ESQ.

5 1717 K Street NW, Suite 900

6 Washington DC 20006

7 202-787-5871

8 cmuha@dillonpllc.com

9 Attorneys for the Plaintiff

10 CROWELL & MORING LLP

11 BY: AMANDA BERMAN, ESQ.

12 1001 Pennsylvania Avenue NW

13 Washington DC 20004

14 202-624-2500

15 aberman@crowell.com

16 Attorneys for the Defendant

17 ALSO PRESENT:

18 CHELSEA GILCHRIST, VIDEOGRAPHER

19 JUSTIN DILLON, ESQ.

20 KIMBERLY BLASEY, ESQ.

21 ELI BERNZ-ZIEVE, ESQ.

Page 22

1 that, never mind.

2 Did you consider in your decision at all
3 what you viewed to be the strength of the evidence
4 against John Doe? Was that a relevant factor in
5 your are calculus?

6 A. Not entirely. In other words, the role that
7 Kathleen Deignan and I played was not to make
8 determinations about strength of evidence; but,
9 rather, once those determinations have been made
10 and a panel has determined responsibility, to then
11 assign an appropriate penalty.

12 Q. Uh-huh, but so would you -- would you
13 sanction someone the same if you were, let's say,
14 95 percent convinced of their guilt as opposed to,
15 say, 51 percent, which would satisfy the preponderance
16 of evidence standard?

17 MS. BERMAN: Objection to form.

18 A. I probably would because my part in the
19 process was not to make the kind of determination
20 that you just described. My part in the process was
21 to receive a decision that a panel had made based
22 on our standard of evidence and based on all of the
23 evidence that they had looked at; and then, once
24 having received that decision, to assign an
25 appropriate penalty but not to second guess their